

# Turn-Taking Analysis on Students' Debate: Conversation Analysis

Maria Olga Jelimun<sup>1</sup>, Yulian Juita Ekalia<sup>2</sup>, Indra Susanto<sup>3</sup>, Skolastika Neldis<sup>4</sup>  
{[mjelimun527@gmail.com](mailto:mjelimun527@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>, [enuyulian@gmail.com](mailto:enuyulian@gmail.com), [Indrassnt6@gmail.com](mailto:Indrassnt6@gmail.com)<sup>3</sup>, [skolastika@gmail.com](mailto:skolastika@gmail.com)<sup>4</sup>}

<sup>1-4</sup>Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia

**Abstract.** In the conversation, normally the participants do not pay attention or are aware of the turn-taking that each one should consider. Therefore, the objective of this study was to investigate turn-taking patterns which are IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) in students' NUDC. The participants of this study were the NUDC teams from classes 2020A and 2021C of the English Study Program of UNIKA St. Paulus, Ruteng. The data were collected using the qualitative method to describe the IRF pattern in students' debates. The procedure for collecting the data was recording the debate, transcribing the spoken text, and analyzing and identifying the IRF pattern used by each debater. The result of the study was the dominant pattern used is IRF with 12 times (44.4%), the second is I with 8 times (29.6%), the third is RF with 6 times (22.2%), while the lowest is IR with only used one time (3.7%). The recommendation for the next researchers is to study the correlation between understanding the debate motion and turn-taking in debate.

**Key words:** conversation analysis, students debate, turn taking

## Introduction

The study of language use in any setting is known as discourse analysis. According to [1], discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the spoken and written language we use when interacting with others. This research focused on the types of initiation in classroom discourse used by the teacher in half Nelson movie. And the it has found six types of initiation in classroom discourse used by the teacher in Half Nelson movie that used by teacher to evaluate students' answer. There were 10 dialogues found as the result of this research, in which the students response specific, students response open ended by their own ideas, pause the interaction as silent because the student was not know the answer and sometimes students response by laughing. Second, in teaching and learning process the teacher used twice of teacher informs to initiate the interaction. The response given by students to teacher informs is silent because the students pay attention what the teacher explain. Third, the teacher used one time of teacher direct to initiate the interaction. The response given by students is nonverbal because the response by use word is not necessary in this initiation, the students only need doing what the teacher ask. Forth, the teacher used twice of listing to initiate the interaction during teaching and learning process. The response given by students for listing are students response open-ended and confusion work oriented because the students excited to the lesson and there are more than one students talked during the lesson. Fifth, the teacher used one time of re-initiation to initiate the interaction in classroom. The

students' gave open-ended response for re-initiation. Last, the teacher used one time of re-initiation to initiate the interaction in classroom.

The students gave open-ended response for re-initiation. The response given by students was open. There were four kinds of initiation that did not use by teacher such as reinforce, check, repeat, and bound initiation. Additionally, Schiffrin, who was mentioned by [2], [3], noted that there are five methods for doing discourse analysis: conversation analysis, pragmatic analysis, ethnology of communication, interactional sociolinguistics, and speech act analysis. The conversation analysis approach is the study's main focus.

Our social lives depend heavily on conversation, which is a part of daily life. In whatever aspect of social interaction, we connect with one another through communication. Two or more people are conversing with one another when there is a conversation going on. The conversation's participants are attempting to communicate in a meaningful and orderly manner, not just to convey their own messages. Analysis of the way the participants are conducting the conversation is crucial. Conversation analysis is defined by [4] as "the systematic investigation of the talk produced in commonplace human contact situations: talk-in-interaction." It is a strategy to examine all forms of speaking in interaction, not only casual chat [5].

Studying conversation aims to uncover or pinpoint not only the language used but also the conversational patterns. Turn-taking and sequencing are two of the core two structures of conversation analysis. Adjacency pairs, preference organization, expansion sequence, repair organization, and tale are some of the structures that the sequence itself possesses. Turn-taking is the type of structure that the researcher looked at.

Taking turns in conversation is done by the speaker and the listener. According to [6], turn-taking refers to how speakers adjust to and manage their turns during a conversation. In a typical discussion, each person speaks in turn as the engagement progresses. It was like in Hillary Clinton and Trump's conversation in presidential election, which found that butting-in Interruptions were most frequently applied by both Trump (65%) and Clinton (5%) during the presidential debate, which means 71% of Trump's interruption and 57% of Hillary's interruption. This shows that both of the presidential nominees were attempting to control another candidate or take the turn. However, they were ignored by each other.

The messages become muddled and the dialogue becomes meaningless when two or more people are speaking at once. Turn-taking, according to [7], is the way that players use turns and maintain one party's conversation at a time. In addition, turn-taking occurs when control is not fixed and the other side assumes control. To put it another way, after the first speaker finishes, the others may begin to talk.

In a conversation, the speaker or the subsequent speaker will choose who will talk next. It's critical to comprehend turn-taking techniques. Offers six turn-taking techniques [8]. When two or more participants are talking at the same time, the messages become unclear and the communication becomes meaningless. According to [7], turn-taking is how the participants use turns and preserve one party's talk at a time. In addition, turn-taking is the situation when unfixed control occurs and the other party takes over the control. In other words, when the first speaker is done, the others may proceed to take the floor.

In a conversation, turn-taking is done either by the speaker or by self-selection by the next speaker. It is important to understand the strategies in turn-taking. In the literature, six turn-taking strategies are described [8]. In order that the entire participant can effectively engage in that social communication, it is better to have a background understanding of turn-taking. Otherwise, he or she may interrupt or overlap other people who is speaking. Furthermore, he may not listen to the conversation.

In addition to the tactics, it is possible to analyze the discussion in terms of patterns, particularly when it comes to turn-taking. In order to analyze the discourse during contact, particularly in the situation of turn-taking, one of the patterns that the researchers looked for can be used. Initiation-Response-Feedback is one of the patterns that the researchers looked for in the student debate (IRF). It is a pattern that is used to examine how students and teachers interact in the classroom. In this exchange, the teacher takes the initiative, the pupils give their input, and the teacher provides feedback. "IRF is a sequence of teacher-student-teacher turns taking place in the classroom," according to [9], [10]. Despite the fact that IRF's primary objective is to examine teacher-student interaction in.

Talking and interacting is what debate is. Related to that, [11], [12] explains that to reach a well-informed decision on a subject, debate is a process of investigation and lobbying. Additionally, [13] claimed that "discussion is an activity that requires a set of discourse for a specific topic." Debate involves competitive interaction between two people or teams. In a dispute, logical reasoning and accuracy are crucial. Debate takes place in a variety of public settings, including politics, business, religion, and education. There has been some earlier research that has been done dealing with the turn-taking in conversation analysis. Political discussion turn-taking tactics were studied by [6].

The investigation of turn-taking patterns in students' National University Debate Competition was the topic of this current study (NUDC). In the realm of education, a NUDC is a particular type of discussion. There are two teams in NUDC: an opposing team and an affirmative team. A NUDC has been in place for the UNIKA St. Paulus Ruteng English Program Study from April 1, 2022. Each team from a representative class is a participant in this debate. The team's audio recording from 2020A versus 2021C served as the study's source of data. Initiation, response, and feedback (IRF) patterns in students' NUDC are the focus of this study. The study's secondary objective is to examine the manner in which students dispute (NUDC).

## **Method and Materials**

The qualitative approach was utilized to describe the IRF pattern in students' NUDC in order to fulfill the study's objectives. Nassaji (as mentioned in [1] believed that descriptive research is crucial in order to explain and describe every aspect of phenomena that occur. This research was done qualitatively by using the students' voice in NUDC debate competition. It was the information from a discussion between the English Program Study courses 2020A and 2021C at UNIKA St. Paulus Ruteng. The IRF pattern in the argument between the positive and opposition teams is the primary subject of this study. Each team has four debating members. The researcher looked at how each debater took turns speaking. The information was gathered through audio recordings. The methods used in this study included videotaping the debate, transcription, and analysis or identification of each debater's turn-taking style.

## **Results and Discussion**

The turn-taking interaction was examined using the NUDC of English Study Program students' IRF patterns. The arguments put forth by the debaters were the main subject. In [14] Sinclair & Coulthard noted that the IRF model describes how classroom interaction proceeds, with the instructor initiating the conversation, the students responding, and the teacher providing feedback. On the other side, when a debate takes place, the IRF model applies, where the

initiating team presents their arguments, the opposing team responds with a point of information (POI), and the responding team provides feedback by responding to the POI.

The script in the table 1 is based on the debate of classes 2020A and 2021C that was recorded. The teams were debating on the motion “This House Agree If the Government should Legalize Abortion in Indonesia”. Each debater may speak up to seven minutes. Furthermore, [15] stated that time allocation for each debater is seven minutes and the opposition team may do the POI. But in NUDC, the last speaker from each team (government whip and opposition whip) has no time for POI. Therefore, there is no interaction happened. The transcription of the spoken text from debate between 2020A and 2021C can be seen in appendix.

In debating, the debaters should participate actively not merely to present their augmentations or ideas based on the motion given, but also to question or to ask for clarification about the presented ideas or what is called as point of information. Debating is just like the normal conversation in which need responses from the listeners, and turn taking must be done between the speakers. Cutting as cited in [16] said that when the speakers are able to hold the turn taking well in the conversation, means that they are cooperative. Based on the transcription, the type of pattern and the frequency of each pattern used by the debaters can be seen in the following table:

Table 1:  
The Pattern Type and their Frequency in the Debate:

No	Debater	Pattern Type	Frequency
1	Debater 1(Affirmative)	IR	1
		IRF	1
		I	1
2	Debater 1 (Opposition)	IRF	7
		I	1
3	Debater 2 (Affirmative)	IRF	2
		RF	1
		I	1
4	Debater 2 (Opposition)	IRF	1
		RF	2
		I	1
5	Debater 3 (Affirmative)	IRF	1
		RF	3
		I	1
6	Debater 3 (Opposition)	I	1
7	Debater 4 (Affirmative)	I	1
8	Debater 4 (Opposition)	I	1
		I	8
		IR	1
TOTAL		RF	6
		IRF	12

Table 1 shows about what type of pattern used by each debater and how many times being used in the debate. Based on the table above there are four types of Exchanges patterns in the NUDC such as: I (initiation), IR (initiation- response), RF (response-feedback), and IRF (initiation-response-feedback). Debater 1 of affirmative team used one time for IR, IRF, and I patterns. Debater 1 of opposition used seven times IRF and one time I. Debater 2 of affirmative used 2 times IRF, and one time for RF and I. Debater 2 of opposition used two time RF and one time for IRF and I. Debater 3 of affirmative used three times RF, and one time for IRF and I. Debater 3 of opposition only used I, because there was no POI from the affirmative team. Debaters 4 of affirmative and opposition only used I, because in debate the last speakers do not have the chance for PIO and they just summarize the ideas of the previous speakers. Based on the table 1, the frequency and percentage of each pattern can be seen in table 2.

Table 2  
Interaction pattern's percentage

No	Type of Pattern	Frequency	Percentage
1	I	8	29.6
2	IR	1	3.7
3	RF	6	22.2
4	IRF	12	44.4
<b>Total</b>		27	100.0

Total interactions in the debate were 27. From that total, the dominated pattern from the debate is IRF pattern, which happened 12 times (29.6%) during the debate. In the second place is I which happened 8 times (29.6%). The third is RF with the total 6 times (22.2 %) and the lowest pattern is IR which only used 1 time (3.7 %).

In the pattern above, the debater initiates the interaction by delivering the speech or ideas. Then, the next pattern is response from the members of the other team. The response occurred when the other team feels there is something needs to be asked or clarified or POI regarding the ideas presented. The, the speaking debater gives feedback to the given POI. Finally, the speaking debater gives initiation by continuing the argumentation before he/she close her turn. IRF pattern was the dominant because the members of the other team were cooperative and active in questioning the ideas from the speaking debater, and he/she was able to answer or respond the POIs.

The second position is I (interaction). In NUDC, interaction, which is by giving POI from the other team, is happened from the second minute up to sixth minute. And from the sixth minute up to finish, there is no POI anymore and the debater is focus on her/his argumentations. And the last two speakers from each team (government whip and opposition whip) have no POI time. In those seven minutes, they just summarize all the ideas from the previous speakers. This is the reason why interaction is in the second place.

RF (response-feedback) is in the third place because in the debate, the other team was trying to ask for POI but the feedback from the speaking debater was just "No, thanks" for several times. Finally, the lowest was IR which happened only 1 time. In NUCD, normally there is no greeting before the debaters deliver the speech. But in this debate, one of the speakers greeted all the people in the room and she got response from them. This is why IR pattern was as the lowest. This study shows that IRF pattern can be applied not merely to analyze the interaction in the classroom but also the other interactions in our social life. By analyzing the interaction using this pattern, we can identify who is the most dominant of our interaction.

## CONCLUSION

Debate is one of the talk-in-interactions. In debate, the debaters are interacting to each other by presenting, questioning, and defending ideas or argumentation. Even though all the participants are allowed to interact in the debate, but they need to consider their turn to take the floor. The above debate shows that in the debating the participants have clear understanding of their points and positions. Each debater knew when to maintain the turn, handing over the turn, or how to take over the turn. When they maintain the turn, it gives more space and time for them to deliver their ideas or point of views. Concentrate in listening the members of the other team will give chance to take the turn by giving POI. And handing over the turn when the speaking debater gave chance to the other team to give POI.

In this study the IRF pattern have been used, and the study shows that there are four IRF pattern types happened in NUDC, with IRF dominating the turn taking in this debate and the lowest is IR. However, this study was only to describe the types of IRF pattern and the frequency of each type. The next researchers may continue to study on this on the other aspects of this topic. The study on the correlation between understanding the debate motion and turn taking in debate is also important.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank the Ruteng Santu Paulus Foundation and the Ruteng Catholic University of Indonesia for supporting this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Chandra, Y. Yulmiati, and E. Kemal, "An Analysis of Initiation Response Feedback (IRF) Pattern in Classroom Discourse at Half Nelson Movie," *Modality J. Int. J. Linguist. Lit.*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 132, 2021, doi: 10.30983/mj.v1i2.4835.
- [2] T. Derin, N. Susilo Putri, M. S. Nursafira, and B. Hamuddin, "Discourse Analysis (DA) in the Context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL): A Chronological Review," *Elsya J. English Lang. Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2020, doi: 10.31849/elsya.v2i1.3611.
- [3] J. Takahashi and G. Song, "In Pursuit of Conversation Analysis: An Interview with Professor John Heritage," *Work. Pap. Appl. Linguist. TESOL*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 59–63, 2018, [Online]. Available: <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1182546&lang=es&site=eds-live&scope=site>.
- [4] K. U. Azamatovna, "Outlining interactional competence: Conceptualisation, teaching, and testing with conversation analysis and concept-based instruction," *Mextesol J.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 0–2, 2021.
- [5] A. Cox and S. Li, "The medical consultation through the lenses of language and social interaction theory," *Adv. Heal. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 241–257, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10459-018-09873-2.
- [6] D. Dwi Natalia, F. Subekti, and N. K. Mirahayuni, "Turn Taking Strategies in Political Debates," *ANAPHORA J. Lang. Lit. Cult. Stud.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 56–63, 2020, doi: 10.30996/anaphora.v2i2.3365.
- [7] C. C. Okeke and G. van der Westhuizen, "Learning from professional conversation: A

- conversation analysis study,” *South African J. Educ.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2020, doi: 10.15700/saje.v40n1a1777.
- [8] S. J. Ibraheem, “Turn-Taking Strategies in English Language Teaching (Elt),” *Dirasat Tarbawiya*, vol. 10, no. 40, pp. 291–308, 2017, [Online]. Available: <https://iasj.net/iasj/article/135181>.
- [9] R. Saswati, “Analysis of Classroom Interaction Using IRF Pattern: A Case Study of EFL Conversation Class,” *Scope J. English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 29, 2019, doi: 10.30998/scope.v3i1.2782.
- [10] S. S. A. S. Kartini, “Initiation-Response-Feedback Pattern Used Cby Lecturer-Students in Efl Classroom Interaction,” *Tlemc (Teaching Learn. English Multicult. Context.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 44–55, 2022.
- [11] M. Mapes, “Integrating critical and trans-affirming pedagogies in argumentation and debate: A heuristic narrative,” *Commun. Teach.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 207–214, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17404622.2018.1467567.
- [12] A. J. Freeley and D. L. Steinberg, *Argumentation and Debate : Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*, 12th ed. Wadsworth, 2013.
- [13] M. Supardi and F. Sayogie, “The Logical Pattern of Argument: A Case Study of National University Debating Championship,” *Elsya J. English Lang. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 65–76, 2022, doi: 10.31849/elsya.v4i1.8466.
- [14] A. Rustandi and A. H. Mubarak, “Analysis of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback) on Classroom Interaction in Efl Speaking Class,” *EduLite J. English Educ. Lit. Cult.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 239–250, 2017, doi: 10.30659/e.2.1.239-250.
- [15] R. Nurcahyo, D. A. Aruan, and I. N. R. Aryana, *Pedoman National University Debating Championship Tahun 2021 i*. Jakarta: Pusat Prestasi nasional Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia, 2021.
- [16] S. Aisyah, “Conversation Analysis of Turn Taking Mechanism in Ever After Movie,” *Lang. Horiz. J. Lang. Stud.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 61–68, 2021.